

Application No. 10/733,763
Amendment dated August , 2006
Reply to Office Action of June 28, 2006

REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for granting an interview on July 27, 2006. In the Office Action that was mailed on June 28, 2006, claims 1-10, 13-26 and 28-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herf et al. (US 2005/0052685), Kurashima (US 6,029,191), and Trebes, Jr. (US 2002/0093980 A1). Claims 11, 12 and 27 are were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herf/Kurashima/Trebes and Helmick et al. (US 6,674,992). In light of this Supplemental Amendment, the foregoing rejections are respectfully traversed.

Entry of Amendment After Final Rejection:

The Applicant respectfully asserts that the amendments presented herein require only a cursory review by the examiner, and respectfully requests that the examiner enter such amendments.

Amendments to the Claims:

Claims 1, 18, and 32 have been amended herein. No new matter has been introduced by virtue of this Supplemental Amendment. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 18, and 32 may be found in the Specification at page 2, ¶¶ 0021- 0023.

103(a) Rejections of the Claims

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three criteria must be met: (1) there must be some suggestion or motivation – either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art – to modify the reference or to combine reference

teachings, (2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success, and (3) the prior-art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *See* MPEP § 2143. Furthermore, the teaching or suggestion, and the reasonable expectation of success must be found in the prior art and not be based on applicants' disclosure. MPEP § 2143 (referencing *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 493 (Fed. Cir. 1991)).

The present invention generally relates to transmitting media objects between users of an image-sharing session (e.g., an instant messaging session). Independent claims 1, 18, and 32 have been amended herein to recite presenting **all of the media objects** within a set of media objects selected by a user with control of the image-sharing session to a user without control. Specifically, all of the media objects within the set are transferred to the user without control regardless of which media objects the user without control requests.

To the contrary, Herf discloses a sequential process of: (1) a transmitting user selecting images to share, (2) a recipient user submitting a request for some or all of the images selected by the transmitting user, and (3) transmitting the images to the recipient user that were requested. *See* Herf, p. 6, ¶ 0061. Herf does not disclose presenting a user without control of an image-sharing session with all of the media objects selected by a user with control. Rather, Herf would require the user without control to request media objects before receiving them.

Furthermore, claims 1, 18, and 32, as amended herein, recite presenting media objects to the user without control “by executing **independent image-processing operations in parallel to: convert** media objects for viewing by the at least one user without control, **transfer** media objects to the at least one user without control, and **load** media objects to be viewed by the at least one user without control.”

Neither Herf, Helmick, Trebes, Helmick, nor any combination thereof discloses the same. Herf is the only reference disclosing an image-sharing service. As previously mentioned, Herf requires three sequential steps to present a receiving user with images from a transmitting user. Kurashima discloses an application sharing system having multiple interconnected terminals capable of sharing media. *See* Kurashima, col. 2 lines 7-54, col. 6 lines 60-67, and col. 7 lines 1-27. Trebes discloses parallel processing of collaborative telecommunication applications. *See*, Trebes, ¶¶ 0154, 0156, 0158, 0205, and 0304-0306. And Helmick merely discloses an online document-sharing system where users can attach electronic messages to shared documents. *See* Helmick, abstract, col. 17 lines 35-44.

It is respectfully submitted that combining Trebes and Kurashima with Herf would not teach or suggest presenting media objects through parallel execution of image-processing operations to convert, transfer, and load the media objects as recited in amended claims 1, 18, and 32. To the contrary, Herf discloses transmitting images only after a recipient user request requests images that a transmitting user attempts to share. Herf's three sequential steps could not be executed in parallel because the transmitting user must first select images to share before the recipient user can images. Also, the recipient user must request an image before it can be transmitted. Therefore, parallel processing, as discussed in Trebes and Kurashima, would render Herf's disclosed image-shareing system inoperable.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that no combination of the cited references describes parallel execution of images-sharing processes to “convert media objects **for viewing by the at least one user without control**, transfer media objects **to the at least one user without control**, and load media objects **to be viewed by the at least one user without control**.”

Application No. 10/733,763
Amendment dated August ____, 2006
Reply to Office Action of June 28, 2006

It is further submitted that dependent claims 2-17, 19-31, and 33-39 are also in a position for allowance based in part on their dependency from independent claims 1, 18, or 32.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1-39 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejection and allowance of claims 1-39. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned by telephone prior to issuing a subsequent action. It is believed that no fee is due in conjunction with the present amendment. However, if this belief is in error, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott B. Strohm
Reg. No. 42,172

SBS/PJHX
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613
816-474-6550